



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(1891) 48 Oh. St. 25, 26 N. E. 222; 11 Columbia Law Rev. 93. Where the contract relates to both realty and personalty and is inseparable, it follows that the agreement may not be enforced as to the personalty either. *Dicken v. McKinley* (1896) 163 Ill. 318, 45 N. E. 134. Ordinarily no fraud on the plaintiff would result, as he receives the benefit of support and education, and may recover the value of his services in *quantum meruit*. *Ellis v. Cary* (1889) 74 Wis. 176; 42 N. W. 252; 17 Columbia Law Rev. 155. The principal case seems correct, in the absence of any statute.

WILLS—EXECUTION—ATTESTATION AT REQUEST OF TESTATRIX.—The testatrix, who could speak or understand only the Creek language, requested a witness who understood both Creek and English, to attest her will and to request the two other witnesses to attest. On the probate of the will, *held*, this did not comply with the Oklahoma statute which required that three attesting witnesses subscribe the will at the request of the testatrix. *Hill v. Davis* (Okla. 1917) 167 Pac. 465.

Although there is no general statutory requirement that the witnesses to a will must subscribe only at the request of the testator, nevertheless, even in the absence of statute provisions the testator should request the witnesses to subscribe, so as to refute any inference of fraud. This request, however, may be indicated by word or conduct and no formal request is necessary. *Woodstock College of Baltimore v. Hankey* (Md. 1917) 99 Atl. 962. But even where the statute requires that the witnesses must subscribe at the request of the testator, N. Y. Decedent Estate Law (N. Y. Consol. Laws, c. 18) § 21, subd. 4, the courts are inclined to uphold substantial compliance with the statute. *Matter of Nelson* (1894) 141 N. Y. 152, 36 N. E. 3; *Matter of Will of Cottrell* (1884) 95 N. Y. 329. Similarly, in the analogous case of a statutory requirement of publication of the will by the testator to the witnesses, a substantial compliance with the statute has been held sufficient. *Brinkerhoff v. Remson* (N. Y. 1841) 26 Wend. 325; *Perham v. Cottle* (1916) 98 Misc. 48, 162 N. Y. Supp. 21. The reason for this attitude of the courts would seem to be a desire to prevent unreasonable hardship; but where there is any evidence of fraud, or if an equivocal inference can be drawn from the conduct of the testator, the statute will be construed literally. *Matter of Kenney* (1917) 179 App. Div. 258, 166 N. Y. Supp. 478; 1 Schouler, Wills (5th ed.) § 329. In the principal case, though the intention of the testatrix seems to have been carried out faithfully, the court was warranted in requiring strict compliance with the statute, since the rights of the testatrix should be guarded carefully where the transactions are carried on through interpreters. See *Stein v. Wilzinski* (N. Y. 1880) 4 Redf. 441.